

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/725,659	12/02/2003	Karin Golz-Berner	4034.003	5041
PENDORF & (7590 03/30/200° CUTLIFF	7	EXAMINER	
5111 Memorial Highway CHONG, YONG SOC Tampa, FL 33634-7356		ONG SOO		
Tampa, FL 330	134-7330		ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER	
			1617	
SHORTENED STATUTOR	Y PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
31 D	AYS	03/30/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

	Application	n No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Comments	10/725,65	9	GOLZ-BERNER ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner		Art Unit			
	Yong S. C		1617			
The MAILING DATE of this commun Period for Reply	ication appears on the	cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress		
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD F WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE N - Extensions of time may be available under the provision: after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this come - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum s - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply Any reply received by the Office later than three months earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	MAILING DATE OF TH s of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no even munication. latutory period will apply and will y will, by statute, cause the appl	IS COMMUNICATION int, however, may a reply be timed to be some ABANDONE.	N. nely filed the mailing date of this com D (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status				•		
1) Responsive to communication(s) file	ed on					
	2b)⊠ This action is no	on-final.				
'						
	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims				•		
4) Claim(s) 12-23 is/are pending in the	application.					
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6)☐ Claim(s) is/are rejected.	6) Claim(s) is/are rejected.					
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.		•				
8) Claim(s) 12-23 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.						
Application Papers	·					
9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the	ie Examiner.					
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any obje	ction to the drawing(s) b	e held in abeyance. See	e 37 CFR 1.85(a).	•		
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12)⊠ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a)⊠ All b)□ Some * c)□ None of:						
1. Certified copies of the priority	documents have bee	n received.				
2. Certified copies of the priority						
Copies of the certified copies	of the priority docume	ents have been receive	ed in this National S	tage		
application from the Internation	onal Bureau (PCT Rule	e 17.2(a)).				
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.						
Attachment(s)						
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)						
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application						
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 6) Other:						

Application/Control Number: 10/725,659

Art Unit: 1617

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Restriction to the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- I. Claims 12, 13 (in part), 14, 16-19, 23 are drawn to a cosmetic composition containing electric carriers where the solid electret material is a polymerized fluorocarbon, classified in 514/725.
- II. Claims 12, 13 (in part), 15-19, 23 are drawn to a cosmetic composition containing electric carriers where the solid electret material is a ceramic, classified in 424/66.
- III. Claims 12, 13 (in part), 16-19, 23 are drawn to a cosmetic composition containing electric carriers where the solid electret material is a non-fluorinated polymer, classified in 424/78.31.
- IV. Claims 20 (in part), 21-22 are drawn to a method for improving absorption of nutrients and/or active agents into the skin by applying to the skin a cosmetic composition containing electric carriers where the solid electret material is a polymerized fluorocarbon, classified in 514/458.
- V. Claims 20 (in part), 21-22 are drawn to a method for improving absorption of nutrients and/or active agents into the skin by applying to the skin a cosmetic composition containing electric carriers where the solid electret material is a ceramic, classified in 424/677.
- VI. Claims 20 (in part), 21-22 are drawn to a method for improving absorption of nutrients and/or active agents into the skin by applying to the skin a cosmetic composition containing electric carriers where the solid electret material is a non-fluorinated polymer, classified in 514/772.4.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions I-III and IV-VI are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case, there are many

ways to improve absorption of nutrients into the skin such as mixing the composition with substances, such as alcohol, which increases the ability to penetrate the skin.

Inventions I-III and IV-VI are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case, the different inventions are totally different compounds. The various polymers and ceramics have different structures, thus leading to different reactivity, binding affinity, mechanism, stability, polarity, bioavailability, efficacy, solubility, and modes of action. Furthermore, the search for one will not lead to information regarding another, and vice versa. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and the search required for one invention is not required for another, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art because of their recognized divergent subject matter, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and a product claim is subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be rejoined in accordance with the provisions of MPEP § 821.04. Process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the patentable product will be entered as a matter of right if the amendment is presented prior to final rejection or allowance,

Art Unit: 1617

whichever is earlier. Amendments submitted after final rejection are governed by 37 CFR 1.116; amendments submitted after allowance are governed by 37 CFR 1.312.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103, and 112. Until an elected product claim is found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowed product claim will not be rejoined. See "Guidance on Treatment of Product and Process Claims in light of In re Ochiai, In re Brouwer and 35 U.S.C. § 103(b)," 1184 O.G. 86 (March 26, 1996). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, Applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution either to maintain dependency on the product claims or to otherwise include the limitations of the product claims. Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder. Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement is traversed (37 CFR 1.143).

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

A telephone call to the attorney is not required where: 1) the restriction requirement is complex, 2) the application is being prosecuted pro se, or 3) the examiner knows from past experience that a telephone election will not be made (MPEP

Application/Control Number: 10/725,659 Page 5

Art Unit: 1617

§ 812.01). Therefore, since this restriction requirement is considered complex, a call to the attorney for telephone election was not made.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Yong S. Chong whose telephone number is (571)-272-8513. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 9-6.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, SREENI PADMANABHAN can be reached on (571)-272-0629. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571)-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

YSC